

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of ARMANI CHANEL JONES,  
Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CRYSTAL JONES,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED  
December 2, 2004

No. 254690  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 00-394483-NA

Before: Meter, P.J., and Wilder and Schuette, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the trial court's order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(b)(ii), (b)(iii), (c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that at least one statutory ground for termination found in MCL 712A.19b(3) was established by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); *In re Jackson*, 199 Mich App 22, 25; 501 NW2d 182 (1993). The evidence, most notably respondent's failure to comply with the terms of her court-ordered treatment plan, clearly supported termination of respondent's parental rights under subsection (g). *In re JK*, 468 Mich 202, 214; 661 NW2d 216 (2003); *In re Trejo, supra* at 346 n 3, 361 n 16. After this Court earlier reversed an order terminating respondent's parental rights and remanded the case to the trial court,<sup>1</sup> the trial court assumed temporary custody over the child and ordered that respondent comply with the parent-agency agreement, which required her to attend individual counseling, attend and complete parenting classes, obtain and maintain employment and housing, attend a Clinic for Child Study, and attend the visits with the child. Despite having over one year to complete the requirements outlined in her parent-agency agreement, the evidence clearly established that respondent remained unable to obtain stable housing or employment, failed to attend counseling on a regular basis, and missed several of the

---

<sup>1</sup> *In re ACJ*, unpublished opinion per curiam of the Court of Appeals, issued May 21, 2002 (Docket No. 234310).

supervised visits with the child as late as February 2004. Furthermore, the caseworker's concerns about the appropriateness of respondent's interactions with the child during the visits and the opinions of the treating therapist, respondent's substance abuse counselor, and the evaluating psychologist also suggested that respondent would be unlikely to parent the child properly within a reasonable time.<sup>2</sup>

Further, we find that the evidence did not establish that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo, supra* at 356-257. Although the evidence indicated that there was a bond between respondent and her child, given respondent's history of failing to make the necessary changes to regain custody of her child despite numerous opportunities, we cannot conclude that the court clearly erred in terminating respondent's parental rights instead of delaying permanency for the child.

Affirmed.

/s/ Patrick M. Meter  
/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder  
/s/ Bill Schuette

---

<sup>2</sup> While the evidence did not clearly and convincingly establish grounds for termination under MCL 712A.19b(3)(b)(ii), (b)(iii), and (c)(i), any error is harmless given that petitioner established at least one statutory ground for termination. *In re Powers Minors*, 244 Mich App 111, 118; 624 NW2d 472 (2000). Additionally, we need not decide whether termination was supported under MCL 712A.19b(3)(j), given that the evidence clearly supported termination under subsection (g).